

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and respectfully requests reconsideration.

As an initial matter, Applicant notes that several claims have been amended to correct obvious typographical errors and to give terms proper antecedent basis.

Claims 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,333,750 (“Odryna”). Odryna is generally directed to a video graphics system wherein a large quantity of video data is independently and selectively made available to plural display devices. (Abstract.) As best understood, Odryna uses a common video graphics adaptor with an “oversize” display buffer, which has a buffer capacity greater than that necessary to drive a single, conventionally-sized video display. (Col. 6, lines 14-19.) Thus, instead of using multiple video graphics adapters to display different images on different displays, Odryna describes using only one video graphics adapter to display different images on multiple displays. (See, e.g., col. 6, lines 43-50.) This is best illustrated in FIG. 1 of Odryna. In FIG. 1A, for example, four non-contiguous, horizontally oriented portions 12a-12d from adapter buffer field 10 are displayed on adjacent display devices. (Col. 6, lines 25-28.) FIG. 1B shows two vertically-oriented portions 12e, 12f from the same video graphics adapter buffer 10 displayed on adjacent, vertically-oriented displays. (Col. 6, lines 28-30.) FIG. 1C and FIG. 1D show other variations of displaying various portions 12 from video adapter buffer 10 on a plurality of display devices. In contrast, Applicant’s claimed subject matter is directed towards displaying multiple video images on a single display device, not a plurality of display devices using a single video graphics adapter buffer.

The Office Action alleges that Odryna “teaches a [] displaying [of] multiple video images on a single display device (fig. 2, item 12, col. 6, lines 23-50) . . .” As an initial matter, Applicant is unable to find reference numeral 12 in FIG. 2 of Odryna and will assume here and throughout that the Office Action is really referencing reference numeral 12 in FIG. 1. Nonetheless, neither FIG. 1 or FIG. 2 show “a single display device” as suggested. Instead, FIG. 2 shows Display 0, Display 1, Display 2, and Display 3. The cited passage, as discussed above, describes displaying two or more portions of an oversized video graphics adapter buffer on multiple display devices.

The Office Action also states Odryna teaches “processing at least one of the video signals after its receipt so [th]at when the first and second video signals are processed, they each generate images of the same size on a display device (fig. 1A, item 12, from col. 3, line 52 to col. 4, line 7).” As already noted, 12*a*-12*d* are all displayed on different display devices, and for this reason alone, Odryna does not anticipate the claimed subject matter. Furthermore, however, the cited passage, at best, describes a system card that allows an external control system to specify a portion of an input data stream to be used as overlay data, what portion of the overlay data is to be displayed in a base image, and where within the base image the portion of overlay data is to be merged. Thus, Odryna, as best understood, does not teach or suggest generating images of the same size on a display device from a first and second video signals but instead appears to teach overlaying a portion of an input data stream over a base image.

As to claim 18, for example, and as discussed above, Odryna does not teach a method of displaying multiple video images on a single display device. Furthermore, Odryna fails to teach “processing at least one of the video signals after its receipt so that when the first and second video signals are processed, they each generate images of the same size on the display device.”

For these reasons, among others, claim 18 is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 19 and 20 add novel and nonobvious subject matter and are therefore also in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 4-6, and 10-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Odryna in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,025,817 (“Uno”). Applicant respectfully disagrees and reasserts the relevant remarks above. As to claim 1, for example, the Office Action states that Odryna teaches a video display system including, among other things, “a memory storage device, operatively coupled to the video processor and storing program instructions which, when executed cause the video processor to format video input signals at both ports, into a video signal that is sent to a fixed pixel video display device whereupon video input signals are scaled to fit to video window areas within the fixed pixel array display (from col. 3, line 52 to col. 4, line 7 and col. 2, lines 23-27).” Applicant respectfully points out, for example, that column 2, lines 23-27 state, “In a preferred embodiment, the hub is particularly adapted for driving a plurality of flat panel displays such as active matrix flat panel displays, dual scan passive flat panel displays, or a combination of such displays.” (Emphasis added.) Claim 1, however, claims that the “video processor [] format[s] video input signals at both ports, into a single VESA compliant video signal that is sent to the fixed-pixel array video display device where upon video input signals are scaled to fit to video window areas within the fixed-pixel video array display device.” (Emphasis added.) Thus, Odryna does not teach what is alleged, and the claim is therefore allowable. The independent claims add novel and nonobvious subject matter and are therefore also in condition for allowance.

As to claim 6, the Office Action alleges that Odryna in view of Uno teaches or suggests the claimed video display system. Applicant respectfully disagrees and notes that the Office

Action ignores claim language. For example, “a video image produced on the display device by the first video signal and a video image produced on the display device by the second video signal, are of substantially the same size on, and in different sections of, the display device.” As noted above, Odryna teaches outputting different images on different display devices not the same one. Additionally, as best understood, Odryna does not teach that the produced images are of substantially the same size – a limitation that the Office Action fails to address. As such, claim 6 is in condition for allowance. The dependent claims add novel and nonobvious subject matter and are therefore also in condition for allowance.

As to claim 12, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above. Furthermore, however, Applicant notes that the Office Action ignores language in claim 12. For example, claim 12 includes “the program instructions further causing the processor to read signals indicative of a tactile contact with the display device and to display on the I/O device, an indication that the tactile contact was detected.” The Office Action does not state where this is taught. Applicant notes that the Office Action may have intended to group claim 12 with the § 103 rejection below. Nonetheless, claim 12 is allowable for the relevant reasons stated above. The dependent claims add novel and nonobvious subject matter and are therefore also in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-3, 7-9, and 15-17 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uno and Odryna in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,802,451 (“Yavid”). Applicant respectfully traverses and reasserts the relevant remarks above. Applicant respectfully points out that claims 2-3 and 7-9 are dependent on claims that Applicant believes are in condition for allowance, as noted above. As such, these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Concerning claim 15, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above. For example, Odryna does not teach, and in view of the other cited references does not suggest, a processor that produces a video image “on the display device by the first video signal and a video image produced on the display device by the second video signal, [that] are of substantially the same size on, and in different sections of the display device.” Instead, as noted above, Odryna teaches displaying different images on a plurality of different displays using one oversized display buffer. Furthermore, Applicant notes that column 3, line 52 through column 4, line 7 of Odryna discusses a base image and a portion of an input data stream to be used as overlay data. Merging overlay data with a base image is different from displaying the first and second image “in different sections of the display device.” As such, claim 15 is in condition for allowance. The dependent claims add novel and nonobvious subject matter and are therefore also in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Dated: June 11, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: Robert S. Beiser
Robert S. Beiser,
Reg. No. 28,687

222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 609-7848 (Direct)
(312) 609-5005 (Facsimile)